

DDA 76-3343

6 July 1976

MEMORANDUM FOR: Director of Personnel

FROM : John F. Blake
Deputy Director for Administration

Fred:

I do not propose to carry on the dialogue with PMCD any longer concerning the appropriate classification of Gene Wilson's job. I do propose to raise the issue when the Agency Supergrade Board first meets. I cannot resist, however, the attached thoughtful memorandum from on the issue. In my opinion, he has hit the nail right on the head.

JS
John F. Blake

Attachment

Distribution:

Orig - D/OP w/Orig of Att

- 1 - DDA Subject w/att (DDA 76-3104 Memo to DDA fr AI-DDA;
Same Subject, dtd 22 June 1976)
- 1 - DDA Chrono w/o att (DO NOT CIRCULATE)
- 1 - JFB Chrono w/o att

DDA:JFBBlake:der (6 July 1976)

DDA 76-3104

22 June 1976

MEMORANDUM FOR: Deputy Director for Administration

STATINTL FROM :
Assistant for Information, DDA

SUBJECT : AI Comments on PMCD Review of Information
and Privacy Staff

REFERENCE : Memorandum for Director of Personnel from
Chief, PMCD, dated 10 June 1976, Subject:
Review of Grade Allocations for Positions
within the Information and Privacy Staff

1. I have reviewed the referenced memorandum from PMCD and have determined that this most recent position by OP remains the same as when we previously discussed their review of IPS. PMCD and O/DDA, at this point, disagree on only four positions. Two of these positions involve junior professional supervisory jobs about which I believe Gene Wilson has said all that needs be said. However, as regards the remaining two positions, i.e., Chief, IPS and Deputy Chief, IPS, I feel strongly that there are important considerations which have not been taken fully into account by PMCD.

2. PMCD's approach to the review of the two senior positions on the staff has been based on the fairly standard method of trying to identify comparable jobs elsewhere in the Government and then comparing grades proposed within the Agency to those already established in other organizations. While there seems to be some confusion as to the grade of the FBI position and its incumbent, I do not believe we should belabor the point. I say this because in my opinion that the comparability approach as such is faulty in the case of IPS for the following reasons:

(a) The Department of State, DOD and FBI all built their present FOIA organizational setups on long-established and experienced public information

or public relations organizations. The new FOIA efforts were, in reality, add-ons of additional personnel to handle an increased volume and a more technical nature of requests from the public. This was not the case with CIA, which had no such on-going public affairs mechanism and for which the whole question of processing FOIA and Privacy requests from the public was a new experience started from scratch.

(b) Since, as reflected in (a) above, no extensive public affairs mechanism exists to back up IPS, the Chief of that unit is required to interface with the public and the media to a far greater extent than are the chiefs of the FOIA processing elements of other agencies. The volume of such contact is heavy and it is to the distinct credit of the present incumbent that we have avoided major flaps.

(c) Whereas a certain percentage of the material processed through the FOIA elements of State, DOD and FBI is sensitive, it should be recognized that the vast majority of the material processed by Mr. Wilson is either sensitive or potentially so. The degree of care that he must exercise exceeds that required of the other organizations.

(d) To an ever decreasing degree, Chief, IPS is being involved directly in the formulation of policy proposals and procedures. In our dealings with other agencies, it has been our experience that their FOIA officers are involved in such matters to a far lesser degree.

3. The essence of the point I am trying to make by the points listed above is that the Information and Privacy Staff, as it is now operating in CIA, is far more than a processing staff, and yet through the comparison procedure being utilized by PMCD, IPS is being graded against organizations that quite clearly are basically processing units.

4. As a final consideration in reviewing IPS, I think it is necessary to set aside external comparisons for a minute and concentrate on comparing the responsibility given

to Chief, IPS to those of other Agency members. Taking into account the external relationships Chief, IPS must maintain, his personal accountability, the high risk of flap potential in his actions, and the judgments he must often make quickly and with little or no assistance, I contend that his position clearly warrants a classification of GS-16.

STATINTL

cc: Chief, IPS

